



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES.

### LATIN *-astro-*.

The material for the study of this suffix has been collected by Franz Seck, *Das lateinische Suffix aster, astra, astrum*, Arch. I 390-404; cf. also Sittl, *Zum Suffix aster*, Arch. VI 508. Additional examples are also found in H. Stadler's article, *Lateinische Pflanzennamen im Dioskorides*, Arch. X 83-115.

Previous attempts to explain the origin of this suffix have been unsatisfactory. A criticism of the earlier explanations is given by Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Arch. I 404-7. His own solution is that the suffix *-stro-*, whether coming from *-d + tro-* (Osthoff) or from substantives in *-os + tro-*, e. g. *flustrum* > *\*flovostrum* (Corsen), was added to nominal stems, e. g. *olea-strum*, *halica-strum*, and from these a suffix *-astro-* was propagated. On the other hand, Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, pp. 329 f., and Stolz, *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, I 543 ff., prefer to follow Ascoli in seeing here the comparative suffix *-tero-*. Lindsay does not concern himself about the 'prefixed *-as-*.' Stolz's suggestion is that, in spite of the quantity of the *a*,<sup>1</sup> these words are to be derived from formations in *-ātus*, e. g. *\*peditaster* > *\*peditāt't(e)ro-*, *formaster* > *formāt't(e)ro*, etc.

The objection to all of these explanations is that they fail to consider sufficiently the lexical contents of the suffix. The suffix is of pejorative value and expresses the resemblance of the derivative to the primitive noun, and generally with a connotation of contempt—'a poor copy of.' This highly specialized meaning and the restriction of the suffix to certain congeneric groups of words suggest at once that we have before us a case of adaptation,

<sup>1</sup> This is one of his objections to von Carolsfeld's explanation. The difficulty, however, is not serious, as there seems to be no evidence for the quantity of the *a* except the analogy of adjectives in *estus*; cf. Marx, s. v. *oleaster*.

meaning by that term "the infusion with some grammatical or lexical value of a formal element originally either devoid of any special functional value or possessed of a value which has faded out so completely as to make this infusion possible," Bloomfield, A. J. P. XII 1; cf. also for the general treatment and other examples of this factor in language, A. J. P. XVI 409-34.

That adaptation had been at work in the case of this formation was noted in the first of the articles cited above, but no attempt was made to determine the mode in which it had operated. The purpose of the present paper is to offer a suggestion that bears upon this point.

In considering this suffix we must keep in mind that it belonged especially to popular Latin and that its use was established before the beginning of our records. Notice the manifestly secondary character of the words that occur in the archaic period: *filiaster*, *peditastellus*, *parasitaster*. Consequently a chronological arrangement of the words would give not the order of their formation, but of their emergence in literature, and accordingly we are warranted in departing from it.

Excepting the names of plants, there is no class of words formed with this suffix that does not make the impression of being a secondary formation. But in the names of plants this suffix seems to be quite at home, and has a very definite value. *Oleaster* denotes the wild olive in opposition to *olea*, the cultivated olive. The distinction is unmistakable; cf. e. g. Verg. G. II 182 and Vulg. Ep. ad Rom. 11, 17 and 24, where the two translate ἀγρίελαιος and ελαία; cf. also Isid. Orig. XVII 7. 61 *Oleaster dictus quod sit foliis oleae similibus sed latioribus arbor inculta atque silvestris amara atque infructuosa*. So *apiastrum* denotes the wild apium, *mentastrum* the wild menta; cf. Pliny, N. H. XX 144 *Mentastrum silvestris menta est*; cf. XIX 159; cf. also Arch. X 103 μένθαστρον = ἡδύσμος ἄγριος, III 36 G. For *pinaster* cf. Pliny, XVI 39 *Pinaster nihil est aliud quam pinus silvestris*; cf. 80. *Lotaster* = wild lotus; *pyriaster* is glossed by *pyrus agrestis*; Pliny, XVI 205 uses *pirus silvestris*. To these should be added *salicastrum*. Pliny, XXIII 20 uses it to denote a wild vine that grows on willows, but the Italian points to the more primitive meaning wild-willow.

There is some slight evidence for a similar use with names of animals. Du Cange reports a gloss *catulaster*: *lo cane salvatico*, and Sittl's quotation, l. c., from the Etymologicum Gudianum,

Ἀγρόστριος αἰξ ἄγριος, looks like an imitation of the Latin under the influence, perhaps, of ἄγριος. But *pullastra* in Varro, if the emendation be accepted, has only diminutive, and *porcaster* in Aldhelm only contemptuous signification.

Now, other formations of this kind in Latin are clearly adaptive—the lexical value of the suffix can be plainly felt—and if this suffix served originally to express the relation between the cultivated and uncultivated varieties of the same plant, I think it may easily be understood how its meaning could be extended to denote resemblance in general with the connotation of inferiority, and how it might then develop into either a pejorative or a diminutive suffix, and sometimes fade out into a mere expression of resemblance or approximation. Thus *\*peditaster* is a 'mock foot-soldier,' *philosophaster* 'a mock philosopher,' *Antoniaster* 'a man that apes Antony.' So too it expresses the fictitious relationships *filiaster* 'a stepson,' *filiastra* 'a stepdaughter,' etc.; cf. the German *wilde Ehe* = concubinage.

The suffix comes back on the class from which it started, and we have *siliquastrum*, so called from its resemblance to the siliqua: *liliastrum* *planta lilii similis*; *ocymastrum* *herba ocymo similis*. *Apiaster* or *apiastra*, the name of a bird so called *quia apes comedunt*, seems at first a strange formation. But it gets its name (cf. *Antoniaster*) 'Bee's-friend' by a sort of oxymoron. Nothing, in reality, but another application of the principle of the analogy of opposites, which will account for the development of a meliorative signification as far as it occurs.

Finally the suffix was added to adjectives. It is interesting to note the closely congeneric nature of the words. They are either designations of bodily defects—*calvaster*, *adcalvaster*, *recalvaster*, *claudaster*, *mancaster*, *surdaster*—or colors that lend themselves naturally to such use—*canaster*, *\*gravaster*, *fulvaster* and *nigellaster*; besides these are only *crudaster*, *novellaster* and *\*mediaster*.

The next question is the origin of the suffix for the names of wild plants. The definiteness of its lexical value leads us to look again for the working of adaptation, and I would suggest that the suffix came from *silvestro-* before its passage into the *i*-declension, being added first to nouns like *olea*, and from these propagating the suffix *-astro-*.

In confirmation of this view it may be noticed that the literary expression corresponding to these popular formations is the use

of *silvestris*; thus, *pinaster* : *pinus silvestris*, *mentastrum* : *menta silvestris*; cf. the examples cited above. Notice also how in English *wild* has almost passed into a prefix for the expression of the same idea.

For the putting of the whole lexical value of an adjective into its suffix, I know of no good parallel; but the process does not seem to me improbable nor essentially different from the formation *execution electrocution* \**hydrocution*.

In conclusion I would call attention to the closely congeneric nature of the group of words to which *silvester* belongs: *campes-ter*, *equester*, *Fanester*, *illustris*, *nemestrinus*, *paluster*, *paludester*, *pedester*, *rurestris*, *semestris* (and other compounds), *telluster*, *terrester*, *vallustria*. *Lanestris* belongs to late Latin and it stands alone. By the side of this group are *agrestis* and *caelestis*, and it seems desirable to regard them, if possible, as belonging to the same formation.

Brugmann, II 184, sees in these words the comparative suffix *-tero-* under the influence of the analogy of *-es-*stems, and is followed by Lindsay, p. 330. Stolz, p. 503, adopts the same view, but considers *equester* for \**equit-tero-* and *pedester* for \**pedit-tero-* more likely starting-points for the development of the suffix. At the same time he admits, p. 420, the possibility (cf. Schweizer-Sidler, KZ. IV 309; Schulze, ib. XXIX 270) that we have in these words, as well as in *agrestis* and *caelestis*, compounds with *sta-*. This view would be supported by the restriction of the suffix in Latin: contrast the very different range of *-τερο-* with nouns in Greek; cf. Otto Keller, Zur lat. Sprachgeschichte, I 150.

In neither case, however, does it seem necessary to divorce the two formations. In the former case *agrestis* might stand for \**agrestis*, with dissimilation—in *terrestris* the conditions are not precisely the same on account of the double *r*, while in *caelestis* we also have a liquid in the first part of the word. On the other hand, if we consider these words as compounds of *sta-*, the difference between *-stri-* and *-sti-* may possibly suggest the Aryan forms: Avestan *rapaēštām* and *rapaēštārəm*, Sanskrit *ratheṣṭhām* and *savyeṣṭhāram*; cf. Jackson, §§249, 330; Bartholomae, Altir Dial. 82; Ar. Forsch. I 30.